

## REMARKS

The Office Action of July 12, 2005, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments from the Office Action have been carefully considered. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, and are allowable as discussed in the amendment submitted October 12, 2005.

As noted in the earlier amendment, the claims now effectively recite a customer driven, sponsor controlled network-based scheduling system and method that effectuates bi-lateral customer driven appointment scheduling with a sponsoring organization. The scheduling system facilitates the sponsoring organization, such as a doctor's office, clinic, auto repair shop or the like, to communicate an invitation to the customer, such as a patient, client or consumer, whereby the customer is only offered appointment times that can accommodate his particular scheduling needs and he directly schedules an appointment with the sponsoring organization via the network. In other words, the display of the schedule is filtered to show only time segments which meet the criteria associated with the individual customer. The criteria may include sponsoring organization availability, contiguous time slot availability and resource availability. The customer will have the opportunity to directly accept and thereby directly schedule the most desirable appointment time. The controller will communicate the information to the sponsoring organization.

The present claimed invention allows for the sponsor (e.g. the doctors office) to establish sponsor controlled parameters that are applied to the particular customers to establish the filtered schedule that fits the particular customer, so that the customer will only see what is relevant to him from the sponsor's viewpoint. As previously noted this is not taught or suggested in the prior art systems. In fact the prior art essentially represent underlying platforms upon which the present unique system can be built. The present system is a customer driven, but sponsor controlled system. The sponsor control through the parameter selection also opens the door for schedule optimization through appropriate sponsor rules. In other words, the sponsor can establish or utilize more complex scheduling rules to optimize the resulting schedule. The schedule

optimization is not merely a time optimization issue, but could be an income optimizing strategy that is employed in the sponsor parameters. The prior art does not teach or suggest the application of any rules or parameters to what is displayed to the customer in any fashion at all. In fact the prior art teaches away from such structures, as the scheduler is intended to be shown EVERYTHING that is available, not a selection of times that particular to what a sponsor would allow the particular customer to accept. The key aspects of the invention are defined in the independent claims and not taught or fairly suggested by the applied prior art. However, should the examiner wish to discuss alternative claim language to define this filtering or other unique aspects of the present invention, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to expedite the present application.

Again, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested, essentially for all the reasons discussed in the amendment of October 12, 2005 and further elaborated upon here..

Respectfully submitted,

  
Blynn L. Shideler/

Blynn L Shideler

Registration No. 35,034

Attorney

3500 Brooktree Road, Suite 200

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Telephone No.: (724) 934-5450

Facsimile No.: (724) 934-5461